

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/716,511	11/20/2003	Pablo Rodriguez Fernandez	03198	5625	
23338	23338 7590 11/02/2005		EXAMINER		
DENNISON, SCHULTZ, DOUGHERTY & MACDONALD			GORMAN, DARREN W		
1727 KING S' SUITE 105	TREET		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			3752		

DATE MAILED: 11/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action	
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	F

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/716,511	FERNANDEZ, PABLO RODRIGUEZ	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Darren W. Gorman	3752	

•	Darren W. Gorman	3/52	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 17 October 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS			
 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or o this application, applicant must timely file one of the follo places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in comp following time periods: 	n the same day as filing a Notice o wing replies: (1) an amendment, a otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in liance with 37 CFR 1.114. The repl	f Appeal. To avoid at ffidavit, or other evid compliance with 37 (ence, which CFR 41.31; or
a) The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date of b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adv event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b) MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	isory Action, or (2) the date set forth in th an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o . ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FI	f the final rejection.	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension a CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened stabove, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three month earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a and the corresponding amount of the fee. atutory period for reply originally set in the	The appropriate extension final Office action; or (2)	on fee under 37 as set forth in (b)
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in com of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any e Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must I AMENDMENTS 	xtension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal	of the appeal.
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further co (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	nsideration and/or search (see NO ow);	TE below);	
 (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a 			g the issues for
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1		gootou olaliilo.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s	121. See attached Notice of Non-C	ompliant Amendmen	t (PTOL-324).
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a the non-allowable claim(s). 		, timely filed amendn	nent canceling
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:		vill be entered and an	explanation of
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-12.</u> Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, b because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under apperry and was not earlier presented.	eal and/or appellant fa See 37 CFR 41.33(d)	ails to provide a (1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	on of the status of the claims after	entry is below or atta	ched.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered by	ut does NOT place the application i	in condition for allowa	ance because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). 13. Other:	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper	No(s)	
•			

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Applicant's proposed amendments would overcome some of the outstanding indefiniteness issues as set forth in the Final Rejection mailed June 15, 2005, such as antecedent basis issues with respect to the "sprinkler mechanism" and the "catch" in claim 1. However, numerous other indefinite issues would remain and some new indefiniteness issues would develop within the claims if the proposed amendment were to be entered. For example, it remains unclear what "a cover-nut for adjusting against said intersection" means. Further, "said cover nut having a fitting means for fitting a respective inlet filter on a lower end thereof" is unclear, because, as understood by the Examiner, the inlet filter (22) is received on a lower end of the piston, not the cover nut (see specification page 8, lines 22-26). Also, the recitation "a control means for controlling omega-shaped elements..." is unclear. In view of the disclosure as best understood, the Examiner cannot decipher what structural element or elements correspond to this "control means". Still further, the recitations of "the lower body" and "the upper body" in claim 1 are unclear. There is antecedent basis for "two bodies of the casing", however, in view of the disclosure, the upper and lower bodies that are assembled together by the "non-detachable stainless steel shaft", as recited in claim 1, are not understood to be the same "bodies" as the two bodies of the casing (see specification page 10, lines 21-23). Other indefiniteness issues that exist include the recitation, "for applying a special tool for opening and closing" as recited in claim 3. It is unclear what is being opened and closed. Further, the recitation, "with a slight stepping with the bases for said cover-nut embedding in at least at three points at 120 degrees", as recited in claim 3 is unclear. What "bases" is this recitation referring to? What does the rest of this recitation mean? The proposed amended claims have not been checked entirely by the Examiner for all instances of indefiniteness under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, therefore the above examples should not be regarded as an exhaustive list of all such instances.

David A. Scherbel

Supervisory Patent Examiner

Group 3700